REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended herein. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 and 9-14 will be pending. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the rejections are respectfully requested.

No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Support for the amendment to the claims is detailed below.

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's statement of the prior art for the reasons of record. (Office action paragraph no. 1)

The rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-14 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 1 to broaden the value of W_B/W_A from the previously recited range of "0.14 to 1" to –0.001 to 1–. Support for this amendment may be found at page 24, line 15, of the specification. Applicant submits that the amended claims are also not obvious over applicant's statement of the prior art.

In arguing against the rejection, Applicant notes that the Examiner refers to the "reasons of record," apparently referring to the rejection stated in paragraph no. 1 of the final Office action dated October 31, 2008, which applied to the claims as amended on February 27, 2009. The Examiner now highlights: "determine the size <u>and mass ratio</u> of the hollow particles ...." However, Applicant

respectfully notes that the Examiner has provided no remarks addressing the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed with that amendment, which supported an "unexpected results" argument presented by the Applicant.

Applicant submits that the "unexpected results" argument made on February 27, 2009, and the Declaration under 1.132 are applicable to the presently amended claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the argument made on February 27, 2009, be considered, and that argument is reiterated here.

Claim 1 recites "two kinds of hollow particles A and B differing in their average particle diameters," and relational formula (4) recites a limitation on the ratio of the mass of the hollow particles A and B. Applicant argues that the data in the Declaration submitted on February 27, 2009, demonstrate "unexpected results" commensurate in scope with this limitation.

The Declaration compares five inventive Examples (A-E) and five Comparative Examples (1-5). The Comparative Examples differ from the Examples in the use of different solutions for the Intermediate Layer Coating Solutions.

Examples A-E all demonstrate the use of two kinds of hollow particles (hollow particles A and B) meeting the limitations of claim 1 (see Table on page 17 of the Declaration). Comparative Examples 1-4 also show use of two kinds of hollow particles, but not meeting limitations (1)-(3) of claim 1. (Each of Comparative Examples 1, 2 and 3 does not meet one of the limitations on L_A and L_B ((1) and (2)). Comparative Examples 2, 3 and 4 do not meet the L_B/L_A limitation (3)). Comparative Example 5 shows the use of only one kind of hollow particle.

As can be seen in the results in the Table of the Declaration, Examples A-E show satisfactory to excellent values of "image uniformity" and "dents in receiving sheet." The values of "printing density" range from 2.08 to 2.16, which are all acceptable (greater than 2.0). By contrast, Comparative Examples 1, 3, 4 and 5 all show one or both of "image uniformity" and "dents in receiving sheet" at unacceptable values, and Comparative Example 2 shows a "printing density" of 1.91, an unacceptably low value that is considerably lower than the values of Examples A-E. Comparative Example 3 also shows an unacceptably low value of 1.93 for this parameter.

Examples 12 and 13 of the specification as well as Examples A to E of the Declaration, which use two kinds of hollow particles A and B in mass ratio satisfying the above condition, show a remarkable advantage in terms of the reduction of the generation of dents on the receiving sheet caused by the transfer roller.

Regarding the presently amended lower limit on W_B/W_A in claim 1, Example A in the Declaration has the lowest value of W_B/W_A, that is, 0.5/65=0.00769 (see pages 2 and 3 of the Declaration), somewhat above the lower limit of "0.001" in the amended claims. As can be seen in the results shown in the Table in the declaration (page 17), Example A shows a good "Dent" result. On the contrary, Comparative Example 4 has a W_B/W_A of 0.01/30=0.00033, which is below the lower limit of "0.001" in the amended claims. As can be seen from the Table in the Declaration, Example 4 results in a significant generation of dents on the receiving sheet. These data demonstrate effects associated with the W_B/W_A parameter, and these effects are commensurate with the lower limit of "0.001." These effects are clearly unexpected over applicant's statement of the prior art.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/566,202**
Amendment filed December 29, 2009
Reply to OA dated October 19, 2009

The pending claims are therefore not obvious over Applicant's statement of the prior art in

the specification.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact the applicants' undersigned agent at the telephone number indicated

below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an

appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other

fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Daniel A. Geselowitz, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,573

DAG/xl

Atty. Docket No. **060074**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\060\060074\Amendment in re OA of 10-19-09

-10-